

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**Summary**

Prior to entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-10 were pending with Claims 1, 6, and 10 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 6, and 10 have been amended without adding new matter. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are pending with Claims 1, 6 and 10 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1-6 and 8-10 in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

**Traversal of Objections**

The Office Action objected to Claims 1-10 as being unclear when referring to the term "request" (Office Action, Page 2). Applicant would like to graciously thank the Examiner for the recommendations which have been incorporated into the claims.

In lieu of the present amendment, the objection of these claims is now moot and Applicant respectfully requests the objections be withdrawn at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

**Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicant has canceled Claim 7 without prejudice or disclaimer and reserves the right to present it at a later time. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 7 is now moot and is not discussed further herein.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1-6 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsueda (U.S. App. No. 2002/0186400) in view of Mansfield (U.S. Pat. 5,014,192).

In regard to Independent Claim 1, the Office Action has not provided a prior art reference or references that teach or suggest all of the features recited in the pending claim.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a printing apparatus that processes a print job and includes: “a receiving unit configured to receive, from an information processing system, a request for canceling the print job received by the printing apparatus and a notification destination indicating that the print job received by the printing apparatus has been canceled, the notification destination being received by the receiving unit and being set by the printing apparatus when the print job is received. . . . and a transmitting unit configured to transmit the information indicating that the received print job has been canceled to the notification destination received by the receiving unit, after the print job has been canceled in accordance with the request for canceling the print job received by the receiving unit” (emphasis added).

Thus, it is possible to transmit the information indicating that the print job has been canceled to the notification destination which is received by the receiving unit and set by the printing apparatus when the print job is received. More specifically, it is possible to transmit the information to a notification destination set for each print job instead of a fixed notification destination.

Reviewing Matsueda, it describes that when the server printing system 12-2 receives a job deletion event from the printer 231, the server printing system 12-2 notifies the client printing system 12-1 that a job status has been changed by the received job deletion event (Figure 2; Paragraph 53). However, the server printing system 12-2 does not receive the notification destination of the information indicating that the job has been canceled (Figure 2). Therefore, it should be realized that the server printing system 12-2 is not configured to receive and set the notification destination when the job is received (Figure 2; Paragraph 53).

Therefore, the server printing system 12-2 of Matsueda notifies the fixed client printing system 12-1 that the job status has been changed by the job deletion event, but does not notify the notification destination set when the job is received that the job status has been changed by the job deletion event, as recited in Claim 1.

Reviewing Mansfield, it describes that a file system sends a message “File not found” to the next file system in the case where a file specified by a file name is not found (Abstract). In this regard, the next file system to which the message is sent is fixed (emphasis added). Accordingly, the file system of Mansfield does

not receive the notification destination of the information indicating that the print job has been canceled. Therefore, it should be realized that the file system is not configured to receive and set the notification destination when the print job is received, as recited in Claim 1. Additionally, Mansfield fails to teach or disclose transmitting the information indicating that the print job has been canceled to the notification destination received and set when the print job is received, as recited in Claim 1.

Because Matsueda and Mansfield lack at least the above-noted features of Claim 1, Matsueda and Mansfield, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in Claim 1, and the Office Action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Independent Claims 6 and 10 are directed to a method of canceling a print job and a storage medium for storing computer-executable process steps for canceling a print job and were rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 1. As such, the arguments set forth above with respect to Claim 1 are applicable to Claims 6 and 10. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 6 and 10 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The remaining claims (Claims 2-5 and 8-9) are dependent claims and depend from one of allowable Claims 1, 6, or 10. Therefore, the dependent claims are also believed allowable because they depend from an allowable base

claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct or credit any underpayments or overpayments submitted in conjunction with this response from/to deposit account number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the (949) 932-3104.

Respectfully submitted,

---

4/17/2009

---

/Jonathan Ibasco/

Date

Jonathan Ibasco, Reg. No. 63,628  
Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division  
15975 Alton Parkway  
Irvine, CA 92618-3731  
Fax: (949) 932-3560